Case 1:15-cr-00002-CM Document 76 Filed 12/02/15 Page 1 of 28

	ce
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
V.	15 CR 02 (CM)
JOSE RODRIGUEZ,	
Defendant.	
x	
	New York, N.Y. November 5, 2015 5:00 p.m.
Before:	
HON. COLLE	EN MCMAHON,
	District Judge
APPEA!	RANCES
PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for Southern District of New Yor CHRISTOPHER DIMASE Assistant United States At	ork
LAW OFFICE OF JOSHUA L. DRATEL	
Attorney for Defendant JOSHUA L. DRATEL	
WHITNEY SCHLIMBACH	

(Case called)

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

MR. DIMASE: Good afternoon. Christopher DiMase for the government.

MR. DRATEL: Good afternoon, your Honor. Joshua Dratel for Mr. Rodriguez who's seated beside me. Also at counsel, Whitney Schlimbach, an associate in my office.

THE COURT: Excellent. Thank you.

This matter is on for sentencing under 15 Crim 02, United States of America v. Jose Rodriguez. Mr. Rodriguez, having been found quilty by a plea to one count of felon in possession of a firearm in violation of 18 United States Code, Section 922(q) (1), this crime carries a statutory maximum penalty of ten years' imprisonment, three years' supervised release, \$250,000 fine, \$100 special assessment. It is a Class C felony.

In connection with today's sentencing, I have received and reviewed the presentence report prepared by senior United States Probation Officer Colleen Tyler, and it's dated September 3, 2015. I have a sentencing submission from the government dated October 28, 2015. I have a very lengthy sentencing submission from Mr. Dratel dated October 13, 2015. Attached to it are a number of letters in support of the defendant, some information about his music career, some information about the work that he has done on addiction while he has been incarcerated.

22

23

24

25

I have received, I should say, two other letters from Mr. Dratel, both dated November 5. One is Mr. Rodriguez's work performance rating evaluating his work as a pre-drug program instructor. One is a different rating, so I've got two of them. And then I have a letter that arrived here in an envelope from Mr. Christopher Olivas on behalf of Mr. Rodriguez. Says he's a very good friend, advocate for the community, good guy.

Is there anything else I should have seen in writing prior to today's proceedings from the government?

MR. DIMASE: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: From the defendant?

MR. DRATEL: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Has the government reviewed the presentence report?

MR. DIMASE: Yes, we have, your Honor.

THE COURT: Any additions, deletions, or corrections?

MR. DRATEL: No.

THE COURT: Do you agree with probation's recalculation of the quideline?

MR. DIMASE: Your Honor, I believe that the guidelines calculation set forth in the probation report is accurate. As we noted in our submission, we are seeking a range in the stipulated guidelines range set forth.

THE COURT: You're standing by the plea agreement?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DIMASE: But I do believe that they are correct about the range. And because it was a YO conviction, the government was not aware of that particular offense when it provided the plea agreement to the defense.

THE COURT: Okay. Does the government wish to be heard on sentencing?

MR. DIMASE: Yes.

THE COURT: Then please speak away.

MR. DIMASE: Thank you, your Honor. I just want to briefly address the issues about the robberies in case that are raised by Mr. Dratel. I think it's probably less of an issue with Mr. Rodriguez than some of the other defendants in this case, but I think Mr. Dratel, in his advocacy for Mr. Rodriguez, is the first attorney to bring this issue as much to the fore.

THE COURT: Yes. I mean, he wrote this great brief, so --

MR. DIMASE: Well, your Honor, I have a few points I think that are important to consider here. No one is going to arque that Mr. Rodriquez was involved until the day of the robbery. I mean, the evidence is what it is. He's obviously not the most culpable person in this case. That's clear. But that you said, I think some of the concerns raised by Mr. Dratel about these sting operations don't really apply Number one, the evidence is clear that Mr. Lopez was the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

individual who approached the CS about committing the robbery, as we've discussed in other sentencings.

THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Lopez was the instigator here.

MR. DIMASE: That's number one.

THE COURT: Really no question about that.

MR. DIMASE: And I think --

THE COURT: Nobody else could be tarred with that brush, but Mr. Lopez was the instigator.

MR. DIMASE: Well, I think that's absolutely right, no one else can be tarred with that brush, but I think that law enforcement bears less of a role because it was Lopez who brought this to --

> Yeah, this isn't --THE COURT:

MR. DIMASE: -- law enforcement.

THE COURT: This is not the Newburg Forum.

MR. DIMASE: And the second issue, your Honor, is nobody directly from law enforcement communicated with Mr. Rodriguez. He was not the target of a law enforcement investigation. CS didn't reach out to him. He showed up on the day of the robbery because he was -- he was contacted by other individuals who were in the process of planning this robbery. So all the arguments about law enforcement targeting people just don't really apply to Mr. Rodriguez.

> THE COURT: Agreed.

MR. DIMASE: The participants brought him in.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And so a lot of the issues that are raised by Mr. Dratel's brief -- casting a wide net, focusing on certain communities, sending CSs out to find any old person they can to commit a crime -- I just don't think those issues are in play here in this case. And I also just want to note that the Hudson case which Mr. Dratel cites and compares at some length to the facts of this case was actually overturned by the Ninth Circuit on appeal, and I have the cite for that. I don't know how much it really matters, but the Ninth Circuit in U.S. v. Dunlap in late 2014 overturned the court's holding; and they discussed how, in that case, the defendants "responded with enthusiasm when approached by agents to commit the crime"; that they planned nearly every detail of the robbery without assistance, including how many men they would bring, what weapons they would use, how they would dress, how they would break in to the stash house, how they would restrain any quards, where they would hide after the robbery, where they would sell the stolen cocaine. They provided the gun, disguises, zip ties necessary to carry out the robbery, etc., etc. And they conclude by saying the government's construct did not violate fundamental due process.

Anyway, I bring that up -- and that's the quote from the Ninth Circuit case. That's what we have here. The defendants brought the guns, they showed up, they planned the robbery, they -- you've heard -- well, you haven't heard the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

tapes, but you've seen --

I haven't heard the tapes. THE COURT:

MR. DIMASE: -- the PSR that reflects what was said. No one's saying Mr. Rodriguez was involved in those early meetings or that he is as culpable as Mr. Lopez or Guerrero; but he showed up on the day of the robbery with guns, with other people, prepared to commit the robbery and I think, most tellingly, as set forth in paragraph 19 of the PSR, is on tape saying: I'm going there for all 12. I didn't come here -- I didn't get involved for just two, referring to kilograms of cocaine.

> THE COURT: Right.

MR. DIMASE: So he was in it.

THE COURT: In it to win it.

MR. DIMASE: To commit this robbery, period. that's my pitch on the robbery staying arguments by Mr. Dratel.

I also just want to briefly address the criminal history. I won't belabor the points because it's described in the government's submission. I think what's really concerning here is the escalating nature of Mr. Rodriguez's conduct. He did have a period where he stayed out of trouble, and that's great. Unfortunately, after that period he upped the game, and now he's showing up to a robbery with two loaded guns. Before that it was mostly drug-related crimes, and I think there's a major distinction between selling drugs, on the one hand, and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

engaging in violate acts like committing robberies. And it is certainly an escalation of his criminal conduct.

I think the quidelines set forth in the plea agreement are reasonable. In fact, the ones calculated by the probation department are actually higher because of the addition of this YO, which the government was not aware of. We're not seeking that high a range, but I do think that a sentence within the range contemplated by the plea agreement, in light of the defendant's criminal history, the escalating nature of this offense, the sentences he's had in the past which did not deter him, and just the nature and circumstances of the offense itself, I think a sentence within that range is appropriate here, your Honor.

So if the Court has any questions, I'm happy to answer them; otherwise, we'll rest on our submission. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Dratel, have you reviewed the presentence report and gone over it with your client?

MR. DRATEL: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Any additions, deletions, or corrections from you?

MR. DRATEL: Our objection -- we had a couple of factual things that were incorporated, but the main one is interpretive issue, legal conclusion, for the Court about the criminal history category in terms -- not so much in terms of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the calculation, but in terms of whether it overstates the -the criminal history because of --

THE COURT: No.

MR. DRATEL: -- the YO, and all that. So that's our only --

THE COURT: No, it doesn't. For me, criminal history is basically how many times have you been involved with the law. So, no, it doesn't. So I'll hear you through on sentencing.

MR. DRATEL: Thank you.

With the objective, obviously, under the statute of finding a sentence that's sufficient but not greater than necessary, I think the most important thing is going forward, and going forward, Mr. Rodriguez since his arrest has made substantial progress in the almost year now, about 11 months since his arrest. And what we've submitted -- and I apologize for getting it to you today, but that's when we got it. I know you're on trial.

THE COURT: Yes, but what a great time to read.

MR. DRATEL: I was here for a little bit. understand.

But the work that he's doing there is, I think, indicative of what he's capable of, what he has learned, the progress that he's made in this period of time, and this is a program that did not really exist at MDC for people to do. MDC

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

is just devoid of anything unless an inmate actually has the initiative to do it, and this is what Mr. Rodriguez has done. And they've already graduated one class from this program, and they're in the middle of another class that Mr. Rodriguez is doing. You see the work report today, the various -- very positive language from the counselor as to what Mr. Rodriguez has done.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. DRATEL: So I think that's hugely important. just want to also point out that Mr. Rodriquez's family is here, significant number, to show their support for him. And that's, I think, also important in the context of what happens in the future. He's got young kids, and he has recognized from this particular situation and the situation that he put himself in that -- he understands what the future portends for him if he loses the discipline that he showed for half a decade in staying out of any kind of significant -- he had a marijuana arrest during that period. This, obviously, was a lapse and a significance lapse that he's paying for, and he understands. still think that makes a quideline sentence, under either projection of the guidelines, greater than necessary given what we've seen in this year that he's been in so far.

I think that another issue -- and, again, this is not This is mitigating -- is the relative culpability. negating. As the agent told him, you know, when they arrested him -- this

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

is on tape as well -- you're a little fish. You got in at the very end. He put in a couple hours that afternoon that he was involved in it. And, again, not to negate, but to in terms of his particular conduct. He did not bring the weapons. They're not his weapons. He did not handle the weapons. He did not own them. No one used them.

THE COURT: No, nobody used them. They went away. They drove away.

MR. DRATEL: I'm sorry?

THE COURT: They smelled a rat and drove away.

MR. DRATEL: The law -- and I know you have experience as a state court judge. There's a big difference between attempt and a consummated crime, and I think that the law recognizes that there is a difference.

THE COURT: There is.

MR. DRATEL: And so I think that that's part of the whole constellation of factors. So I think that is one of them that's important in the context of determining what the appropriate sentence is. And I know the Court has sentenced Mr. Guerrero to three years. Mr. Guerrero is the person who recruited Mr. Rodriguez. They're cousins. There's a certain level of influence, unfortunately, and I know that there are differences. I know that Mr. Guerrero did not have a record, but his involvement in the crime was significantly greater than Mr. Rodriguez.

1 THE COURT: Correct.

MR. DRATEL: I know it's hard to match all of that together, but and I do think there is, you know, a record -- I understand that involvement, you know, on the wrong side of the law is something that just gets cataloged, and the defendant is stuck with it. But I do think that of these offenses when they involve marijuana, when they're YO, it gets included -- I think about it as a state court practitioner who tells a client that he's got to take a YO or recommend a YO when he's a kid, and then it comes back to haunt him all these years later.

THE COURT: Comes back to haunt him when he commits a crime and they make it federal.

MR. DRATEL: I understand. But the point is you won't have a record, and that is a record for this purpose. And no one tells people that that's the ultimate consequence.

THE COURT: No one told people. I think people are starting to tell them now.

MR. DRATEL: No, now they are. Collateral consequences, the whole issue of collateral consequences, is now a dominant aspect of sentencing, particularly at the state level for minor offenses. But at the time, I don't think so.

THE COURT: No, you're absolutely right, at the time it wasn't an issue at all.

MR. DRATEL: I also think there's a difference between a state arrest and the state system and the way that it

2 3

disposes of cases. You know, he has all these points from a single day of disposition. And in a federal case, in which the seriousness of federal court is manifest from the first appearance in --

THE COURT: I don't know. Don't get me started because usually it's the government who gets slammed by me for disrespecting the state courts. I understand there are differences in the system, but as far as I'm concerned, it's equally serious; and the judges are capable. And I have to be an equal opportunity person here.

MR. DRATEL: That's not my point. I'm not talking about from the judicial -- the systemic point. I'm talking about from a defendant's point of view. It's a very different set of lessons that you learn being in that system, and this system teaches those lessons very quickly. And that's why I think that this 11-month period and whatever period the Court seeks to -- thinks is appropriate going forward, at the same time that when you're talking about what the guidelines look like, that's to me exorbitant in the context of what the sentence ought to be for Mr. Rodriguez in this case. But I think part of that is the gravity of being in the federal system and the -- and the wake-up call that it gives to people who think that the state system and the way it works is just going to be this revolving door that will allow them in and out for periods of time. So I think that that's a factor, and I

think that that's reflected, again, in what he has done thus far.

We put in the statistics, I think, in terms of guidelines, just to say, 75 percent of the cases in this district are below the guidelines. And less than 50 percent of -- only 24 percent are government sponsored. This is for three quarters of fiscal year 2015. So this is a trend that's been happening since Booker. It's only increasing since Booker. I think that reflects a consensus that the guidelines are too high for most offenses, and they reflect sentences that aren't necessary and that sufficient but greater than necessary is below that. I think that that's part of what we have to deal with in the context of the way the guidelines tend to create this yardstick that the consensus of the entire court here is that it doesn't.

So I think that a sentence below the guidelines is appropriate, your Honor. I think it's sufficient but not greater than necessary. And I think that we're in the inception or maybe we're in the middle of an era in which recognition about incarceration and reentry and all of those issues that are very important, that we're seeing a change in that. And I think part of that is an opportunity to get

Mr. Rodriguez back into society at the appropriate time, but not longer than necessary, so he can reenter in a way that can take advantage of his talents that he's shown and also while

he's shown at the MDC.

And so that's all I'm asking, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Anything else from the government?

MR. DIMASE: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Rodriguez, you want to say anything to me?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. Would like to first thank you for allowing me -- taking the time to read my letter to the courts. I appreciate it a lot. I'd like to thank the lawyer for the job he have done representing me. I also like to thank my family for coming. I don't deserve their support. They've been here day one. Of course, they have visit. They made every e-mail. They supported me, never left my side when I didn't deserve their support.

As you know, my name is Jose Rodriguez. I grew up in the Bronx. I didn't really have --

THE COURT: You're talking so fast --

THE DEFENDANT: I'm sorry.

THE COURT: -- that the court reporter is having a really hard time understanding you.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm sorry. I said my name is Jose

Rodriguez, and I'm from the Bronx. I grew up mostly in the

Bronx. As you mostly know, I didn't come from a bad family, so

I came from a family -- my mom was a hard worker. She always

tried support me and my brothers. It be times that I come home from the street as I got over and I would see her asleep, having books, studying hard so she can achieve to be a greater person. Things I didn't understand when I was younger, but I understand now, the sacrifice that she made, me becoming a parent couple years ago. You know, I made mistakes in my life, your Honor. I'm only human. And for every mistake that I made, as you see in my rap sheet, I've learned from.

When I was 18 -- when I was 18, I got sent to -- I went to the Dominican Republic to play baseball, and I was on the verge of getting signed. And I tore my rotator cuff, and that destroyed me. I didn't know what to do with my life. I came back to New York lost. And as you see in my record, that's when I started getting in trouble. Took me a little while to get on my feet, know where I wanted to go. As time went on, I made that mistake in 2010, I made that decision, and I returned back to this -- to this situation that I'm in now. And, unfortunately, I am in front of you.

But I've learned a lot in those times, your Honor. I have -- came so close to progressing myself in my career, my music. I had always had jobs, but I decided to leave my job to chase this career full time because I just wanted to give my family a better life. And I struggled two years, hard working, where I actually started seeing the fruits of my labor, your Honor. And once I started seeing my music take off, I still

decided to have a backup plan to go to school that I was attending before my incarceration, just to better myself and make sure if things don't work out, I have a backup plan, your Honor. Even though things didn't work out now, I don't want the decision that I made on December 14, that I take full responsibility for and I'm fully guilty of, to be another rotator cuff, your Honor. I don't want to feel lost again. I know where I'm going in my life. I know what I want to do with myself. I plan on going right back into school, same thing I was doing before, working hard on my music. This was a great wake-up call. You know, I didn't let the time I'm incarcerated hinder me. I try my best to make it positive. Every day wake up, stay positive. I try to stay out of trouble because I don't want to put my family through this, you know.

I just ask you take into consideration everything my lawyer said, everything that has been said and he's written in his letter. And I just ask you, don't look at the file that I have on my past, because that's mistakes I cannot change, but I did learn from every single one that I made. I'm asking you to look at my family letters, look at the pictures I have of my kids. You know, they mean the world to me. And I have one standing behind me that's eight years old. The other one, I didn't want him here because I didn't want him to see his father in this position that I'm in.

I just ask that you have mercy and take some type of

leniency in me, knowing I learned a lot from my mistake, and every day I'm getting better and better. I try to make myself a better man, not only for me but for my family. And I just ask that if you do, I promise not only myself, my family who's sitting behind me, a judge of court, yourself, or the courts, never to be in this situation again. You'll never see me in this courtroom unless it's for the completion of probation. I simply ask you to take all those things into consideration. And thank you for allowing me to speak, and God bless the courtroom. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Well, first of all,
Mr. Dratel, I want to thank you for the excellent presentation,
the written presentation, very, very interesting. I'm not a
big fan of government sting operations, pretty much of any
sort. But except in one instance, and the one instance is when
the government isn't the initiator of the sting but simply
takes advantage of the happenstance that somebody else looking
is looking to commit a crime, and that of course is what
happened here. And I also have very different attitudes about
people who are inveigled into committing crimes by the
government and people who are enthusiastic recruits, to use
the Ninth Circuit's formulation. And I think that my opinions
in Cromitie make it clear that I drew a very clear distinction
between Mr. Cromitie and the other three individuals who were
very enthusiastic recruits. They weren't in it for very long,

but they were in it very happily.

I don't know what was going on in your life,

Mr. Rodriguez, and I don't know what was going on in your music

career, and I don't know what was going on in your relationship

with your lady or one of your sons' mothers or your own family,

or whatever it was. I don't know what was going on that caused

you to be susceptible to the brandishments of your cousin; but,

boy, you were. And you came in with great enthusiasm into this

planned robbery, into this deeply violent planned crime. And

your lawyer points out that I gave your cousin 36 months. He

was in it longer. He was in it deeper. He wasn't Mr. Lopez.

On the other hand, he was in it pretty much from the beginning,

but he didn't have any kind of a record. I mean, Mr. Ortiz

wasn't in it for very long either, but Mr. Ortiz, like you, had

a pretty substantial criminal history and a lot of brushes with

the law from which he had obviously not learned very much.

So when I look at you and your cousin and I look at your relative criminal histories and your relative involvements in the case, frankly, it all kind of balances out with me, you and your cousin, and I think you should do the same amount of time as your cousin and pretty much for two reasons: The record, including especially the tapes, indicate that you were, if a last-minute participant, a very enthusiastic one. And you came to this not as a first-timer or a second-timer, possibly, to this kind of crime, but you came into criminal activity

having had repeated brushes with the law and having learned little or nothing from them.

And it is tragic, as Mr. Dratel points out, because somewhere between the last time you were arrested and pled and the terrible day when this went down, you had actually manned up to your responsibilities as a father, and you were at work on getting certification of some sort to be a tax preparer, which impressed me a whole lot more than the music thing, I have to tell you. You're about the 850th defendant who I've sentenced who told me he was going to have a music career, and not one of them has actually had a significant music career.

And I don't think any of them ever will. But you were going to do some good, honest work as a tax preparer. I thought that was great. But you went off the rails very spectacularly.

Now, you obviously have drug issues which you are in the process of confronting, and you're confronting them in what I consider to be a very constructive way over at the MDC, helping not only yourself but a lot of other people. And I am going to recommend, as I recommended for your cousin, that you be considered for the Bureau of Prisons' residential drug assistance program, the 500-hour program. It seems to me you're a pretty ideal candidate for that program. You have a history, but you have a demonstrated commitment to turning away from a life of drugs. And if I were the Bureau of Prisons,

which I'm not -- and Mr. Dratel will tell you all I can do is recommend. I can't force them to take you in that program -- but if I were the Bureau of Prisons and I looked at this record of what you've done while incarcerated, I would say, hmm, this is one that's worth taking a risk on. So I will make that recommendation. I will make it very strongly. And that may end up cutting some time off your period of incarceration. I hope you're picked for the program.

But considering all of the Section 3553(a) factors, much of what the government says is absolutely true, and taking into account the unbelievably more serious nature of what it is that you involved yourself with here and the obvious fact that much shorter sentences have not driven the point home that you can't do these kinds of things, it seems to me that the sentence that is sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to punish you for what you did is exactly the same thing that was sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to punish your cousin for what he did. All in the family. So that's what we're going to do. And I hope that this is the last time anybody ever has to sentence you to anything.

I have reviewed the presentence report. I accept and adopt as my findings its description of the offense and the offense conduct. Its calculation of the guidelines is, in fact, correct. The defendant has 11 criminal history points, and that really does put him in Criminal History Category V,

not Criminal History Category IV as the government initially thought. The total offense level for this crime is 17, and the guidelines, 46 to 57 months, is the correct guideline. The government has indicated that it would advise the Court to adhere to the guideline calculation in the plea agreement, which was 37 to 46 months. It's going to be varying sentence anyway, but it's a varying sentence of one month from the government's proposed clarification. And I thank the government for standing by the plea agreement.

I have considered all of the Section 3553(a) factors, and for the reasons previously articulated conclude that the sentence that satisfies the parsimony clause that deals with the defendant's recidivism and, to this date, inability to learn that no means no, when balanced against his relatively minor role in this endeavor, that a sentence of 36 months is the appropriate sentence for the defendant in this case. I have taken into account the defendant's good work at the MDC. And, as I said, I believe that the Bureau of Prisons should look very favorably on Mr. Rodriguez when evaluating candidates for the RDAP program.

Sir, will you please stand. Under docket No. 15

Criminal 2, the total offense level is 17; the Criminal History

Category is V. This is a varying sentence. I hereby sentence

you, Jose Rodriguez, to be remanded to the custody of the

Attorney General of the United States and the Bureau of Prisons

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

for a term of 36 months to be followed by a term of three years' supervised release. You are required to pay a special assessment for the costs of \$100. It's due and payable immediately, but if you can't pay \$100 immediately, it will be deducted from your prison wages at the rate of \$25 a calendar quarter or 50 percent of your gross monthly earnings from a UNICOR Grade 1 through 4 job.

It is my recommendation -- I think this is what you want, Mr. Dratel -- that the defendant be kept in the New York City metropolitan area --

MR. DRATEL: Yes.

THE COURT: -- to facilitate visitation. defendant has an excellent relationship with his children, and we would like that to continue.

MR. DRATEL: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: I think it's very important that it continue. The Court also strongly recommends that Mr. Rodriguez be considered for RDAP.

When you get out, sir, you will abide by the following conditions of supervision: You can't commit another crime. You've gone federal now, and you've gone federal in a big way, felon in possession of a firearm. The second time that happens, it's quite draconian, but the sentence lasts for a very long time. So you don't want to do that. You really don't want to do that, and you don't want to commit any crime,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

federal, state, or local, because I'm kind of a zero tolerance judge.

I think you should probably look at me right at this time.

I'm a zero tolerance judge. And if you do commit another crime -- go to state court, go to federal court, I don't care where -- they'll punish you for the crime, but I'm going to punish you, too. I'm going to punish you for violating the terms of your supervision. You've got three years under my thumb when you get out.

You shall not illegally possess a controlled substance. If you have a drug, it better be from a pharmacy with your name on the prescription bottle. You have to participate in a program approved by the United States Probation Office that will include testing to determine whether you have reverted to using controlled substances. authorize the release of available drug treatment evaluations and reports to your substance abuse treatment provider as approved by your probation officer. You'll be required to contribute to the cost of services rendered in an amount to be determined by your probation officer based on your ability to pay for or the availability of third party payment.

You cannot possess a firearm or destructive device. There are no excuses. There are no exceptions. There are no justifications whatsoever for a violation of that.

You have to cooperate in the collection of genetic identifying material, DNA, for inclusion in criminal databases as directed by your probation officer.

You have to obtain legitimate and verifiable employment. I have to tell you that pursuing your music career is fine in your spare time, but that's not a job. You have to get a job, a real job, kind of job that the probation officer can call the boss and say: Is he reporting to work on a regular basis? Could I see his last three pay stubs? Has he been giving you any trouble?

You can't associate with people who have been convicted of crimes, and you can't be found in places where criminal activity is being planned or carried out. You seem to have a lovely support system back there, and I think you should associate with them instead of the kind of people that you and your cousin were associating with when you got into this mess.

Your probation officer has to know where you live and your probation officer has to know where you work, and you can't change your home address and you can't change your work address without giving ten days' advance notice to your probation officer who then gets to decide whether the place you are proposing to go is an appropriate place. And if there's an emergency, like there's a gas leak or there's a fire in your apartment and you have to leave very quickly, you only have 48 hours to call a probation officer and tell the probation

officer where you can be found.

You are to report to the nearest probation office within 72 hours of your release from custody. And it's my recommendation that you be supervised in your district of residence. You will be given a list of the standard conditions of supervision, and you will acknowledge that you've received it. And you must abide by all of those except for the special condition on drug treatment as noted.

There's no fine being imposed in this case, no restitution, no forfeiture.

Okay. Was there a plea agreement?

MR. DIMASE: Yes, your Honor, there was.

THE COURT: When you took your plea, Mr. Rodriguez, you remember that you signed a letter and the U.S. Attorney signed a letter and Mr. Dratel, they all signed a letter?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay. In that letter it said if I sentenced you to 46 months or less in prison, that you would not take an appeal from your sentence and you wouldn't bring a lawsuit challenging the legality of that sentence. Do you recall that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Did Mr. Dratel explain to you that by signing the letter, you were giving up the right you would otherwise have to take an appeal from your sentence?

1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. THE COURT: Okay. Did you sign the letter of your own 2 3 free will? 4 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. 5 THE COURT: Okay. So I've sentenced you to 36 months, 6 which is less than 46 months, so it's my understanding that 7 you've waived your right to take an appeal. Is that also your 8 understanding? 9 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. 10 THE COURT: Okay. Now, technically, because I've 11 sentenced you to 36 months instead of 37 months, the government 12 could take an appeal from your sentence. I doubt very much 13 that's going to happen, but in case it did, you would have the 14 right to be represented by a lawyer and to have counsel 15 appointed to represent you without charge if you couldn't afford a lawyer. 16 17 Do you understand that? 18 THE DEFENDANT: I understand. 19 THE COURT: Okay. Have a seat. 20 Mr. Dratel, do we have anything else from you? 21 MR. DRATEL: No, your Honor. Thank you. 22 THE COURT: Mr. DiMase, anything from the government? 23 MR. DIMASE: The government would move to dismiss any

THE COURT: Open counts are dismissed as against the

open counts against Mr. Rodriguez.

24

25

Case 1:15-cr-00002-CM Document 76 Filed 12/02/15 Page 28 of 28

FB5HRODS Sentence defendant. MR. DIMASE: Nothing further. THE COURT: Okay. Good luck to you, sir. These proceedings are closed. MR. DRATEL: Thank you, your Honor. (Adjourned)